

STATES OF JERSEY



Jersey

DRAFT WATER LAW (JERSEY) AMENDMENT REGULATIONS 202- (P.26/2026): AMENDMENT (P.26/2026 Amd.) – AMENDMENT

**Lodged au Greffe on 17th March 2026
by Deputy K.L. Moore of St. Mary, St. Ouen and St. Peter
Earliest date for debate: 24th March 2026**

STATES GREFFE

DRAFT WATER LAW (JERSEY) AMENDMENT REGULATIONS 202- (P.26/2026):
AMENDMENT (P.26/2026 AMD.) – AMENDMENT

PAGE 2, AMENDMENT –

In the Amendment, in the third column of the table, for “1 April 2033” substitute “1 January 2030” in both places.

DEPUTY K.L. MOORE OF ST. MARY, ST. OUEN AND ST. PETER

REPORT

In the summer of 2025, the Scientific panel's [Draft Interim Phase Two of the Fourth Report](#) recommended that the reduced limit of 4 ng/l should be implemented within 5 years (p.91). Accordingly, whilst the Minister for Treasury and Resources claims to be offering a pragmatic approach, her amendment should be amended.

This amendment offers a route that provides drinking water that meets the safety limit proposed by the scientific panel within the time frame that they recommended, rather than the later date that is proposed by the Minister for the Environment.

Providing wholesome water is a critical infrastructure and health issue. It should not be subjected to delay.

It is understood that the figures suggested by Jersey Water (circa £200 million) for installing a system to treat all mains water is considerable. If that is not achievable, other routes can be explored and implemented to remain within the timeframe and prioritise the health of Islanders.

Whilst this was not the preferred option of the Scientific panel, one way to achieve the 4ng/l target within the timeframe would be to install reverse osmosis drinking water supplies in every home and business premises in the island. At £550-800 per domestic unit (depending on quality), it could reasonably be expected that such a considerable requirement of about 70,000 units would secure a good price and we could aim to spend less than £40 million.

There would also have to be a requirement for property owners to service the units and for a safe disposal programme for the filters to prevent inadvertently causing further PFAS contamination.

There is already guidance for landlords with regard the provision of safe water from private water sources. The next Minister for the Environment could easily amend existing legislation and regulations to enforce such rules for all property.

It could also be considered whether the public purse should pay for the installation of these units, or whether property owners should pay for them. Again, this is a decision for the next Assembly. A payback or grant scheme could be created, for example, for those Islanders who benefit from the Community Costs bonus.

The Island has sought the views of the distinguished members of the Scientific Panel and we should act swiftly to ensure that we follow their advice. This amendment serves to ensure that this important matter is delivered upon.

Financial and staffing implications

There are no additional financial or staffing implications (FSI) for Government as a result of this amendment as it is in line with the original proposition, which had no FSI for Government, with the deadline for action brought forward by 1 year. If alternative water treatment methods are considered, for example installing RO units for drinking water on each premises, this would cost less than £40 million pounds. But as this amendment identifies, it will be a policy matter if this cost would be incurred by the public purse or through a user pays scheme.

Children's Rights Impact Assessment

I consider that this amendment has no direct or indirect impact on children and that the duty to have due regard to the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child does not arise. Accordingly, a Children's Rights Impact Assessment is not required under the [Children \(Convention Rights\) \(Jersey\) Law 2022](#).